National
Academy
of
Sciences

National Research Council

NAS-NS
1103

NUCLEAR SCIENCE SERIES
Radiochemical Techniques

Low-level
Radiochemical
Separations

U.S.
Atomic
Energy
Commission

COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR SCIENCE

Low-level Radiochemical Separations

T. T. SUGIHARA

Jeppson Laboratory
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

April 1961

Subcommittee on Radiochemistry
National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council

FOREWORD

The Subcommittee on Radiochemistry is one of a number of subcommittees working under the Committee on Nuclear Science within the National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council. Its members represent government, industrial, and university laboratories in the areas of nuclear chemistry and analytical chemistry.

The Subcommittee has concerned itself with those areas of nuclear science which involve the chemist, such as the collection and distribution of radiochemical procedures, the establishment of specifications for radiochemically pure reagents, availability of cyclotron time for service irradiations, the place of radiochemistry in the undergraduate college program, etc.

This series of monographs has grown out of the need for up-to-date compilations of radiochemical information, procedures, and techniques. The Subcommittee has endeavored to present a series which will be of maximum use to the working scientist and which contains the latest available information. Each monograph collects in one volume the pertinent information required for radiochemical work with an individual element or with a specialized technique.

An expert in the particular radiochemical technique has written the monograph. The Atomic Energy Commission has sponsored the printing of the series.

The Subcommittee is confident these publications will be useful not only to the radiochemist but also to the research worker in other fields such as physics, biochemistry or medicine who wishes to use radiochemical techniques to solve a specific problem.

W. Wayne Meinke, Chairman
Subcommittee on Radiochemistry

iii

INTRODUCTION

This volume which deals with low-level radiochemical spearations is the third in a series of monographs on radio-chemical techniques which will parallel the series on the radiochemistry of the elements. The same general style is used in both series of monographs, including general reviews of the technique, discussion of the principles involved, a survey of applications to different systems, and finally a collection of selected procedures which use this technique as reported in the literature.

This second series of techniques monographs will cover a number of radiochemical techniques which have not been reviewed elsewhere. Plans include revision of these mono-graphs periodically as new information and procedures warrant. The reader is therefore encouraged to call to the attention of the author any published or unpublished material on low-level radiochemical separations which might be included in a revised version of the monograph.

CONTENTS

Low-level Radiochemical Separations

T. T. SUGIHARA
Jeppson Laboratory
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

The widespread use and occurrence of radioactivity and the increasing
interest in less probable nuclear reactions have forced many nuclear and radio-
chemists to use low-level methods of isolating and detecting radioactivity. It
is the purpose of this review to consider some of the general aspects of low-
level radiochemical separations and discuss a few specific procedures. Since
it is difficult in many cases to know from the title of a paper, its abstract,
or sometimes even the text of a paper, whether a low-level method was used, the
author makes no claim as to completeness of the literature surveyed in preparing
this monograph. Furthermore, since many separation methods used at ordinary
levels may be converted to low-level procedures with only minor alterations,
there exist potentially an infinite number of low-level separation schemes. The
references cited here should be taken to be only representative ones and are of
course those about which the author knows the most. There are no doubt many
other low-level methods, published and unpublished, and the author would appreci-
ate receiving information about them. Unfortunately, few papers discuss the de-
tails of the precautions taken to achieve high radiochemical purity and other
characteristics of a low-level method.

The major use of low-level methods has been in (1) environmental studies of naturally occurring or artificial radioactivity,[66] (2) research in cosmic-ray-induced radioactivity in meteorites[52] and atmospheric nuclei,[74,104] (3) determination of nuclear-reaction cross sections in the submicrobarn region,[28,82] (4) studies of nuclear reactions in which the available beam intensities are very low (e.g., pion-induced reactions[118] or resonance fission[92]) although cross sections are large, and (5) trace-element determination by activation analysis.[90]

Low-level radioactivity can be defined in terms of a signal-to-noise ratio (sample-to-background ratio) - for example, an activity for which the ratio is of the order of unity. For radiochemical purposes, however, this is not necessarily adequate. One of the important criteria for evaluating a low-level procedure is the blank, as will be discussed below. A blank of one count per minute (cpm) may be negligible in a counter system whose background is 25 cpm, but it is of very great importance when the background rate is of the order of 0.2 cpm, a typical rate in many beta counters in common use.[50,78,107] Thus in this discussion we shall be concerned with small absolute amounts of activity (< 10 disintegrations per minute) as well as signal/noise ratios of the order of unity.

The kinds of counters used and the ingenious methods devised to reduce background are outside the scope of this discussion. A number of specific* and review[7,33,59] articles have appeared on the subject in the past few years.

Generally speaking, low-level radiochemistry shows some strong resemblances to trace-element determination by colorimetry.[98] Many of the injunctions applicable to the latter area have counterparts in the radiochemical case.

---

* Beta proportional or Geiger counting - references 10, 12, 35, 57, 62, 74, 78, 84, 87, 101, 107; solution scintillation counting - references 1, 8, 15, 18, 31, 55, 56, 88; NaI scintillation counting - references 5, 14, 21, 36, 48, 111.

For a low-level procedure to be a good one, certain requirements must be met:

1. Zero or small and constant blank.

2. High chemical yield.

3. High radiochemical purity.

4. Ease of preparing sample in suitable chemical form for counting. All of these criteria are, of course, applicable to radiochemical separations at ordinary levels, as well as some others such as speed, which in general is not so important in low-level work. The difference in relative importance of some of these factors will be discussed below.

Blank Determinations

A blank in radiochemical separations means approximately what it does in trace element analysis: the contribution of the added reagents and other constituents of a sample to the quantity measured. A given procedure may of course have a different blank for a counting method using gamma-ray pulse analysis as compared to one which involves gross beta activity.

It is frequently not simple to decide how a blank is to be measured. For example, consider the following case: low-level measurements are to be made of fallout Ce^{144} in samples of sea water. A procedure is devised which isolates cerium chemically. A blank is determined by adding inert cerium carrier to a volume of distilled water comparable to that of sea water in an actual sample; this is followed by the procedure using the same reagents in the same amounts as in isolation of a real sample, and finally the cerium fraction is counted. This does not necessarily constitute a satisfactory blank determination since it determines only the contribution of added reagents. Sea water may contain non-cerium activities (referred to as X below) that tend to follow cerium chemistry, particularly when holdback carriers are not present. Ideally the blank should be determined in a sea water system containing X but no Ce^{144}. However,

3

in this particular case and at this time there do not exist sea water samples which we can be sure are free of Ce^{144}. Even samples collected at 1500 meters appear to contain measurable amounts.[108]

A method which appears to be better - but is not - is to add inert cerium carrier and recover it from a sea water sample that has already been processed once. The first cerium separation (assumed to be quantitative for simplicity) should remove (1) Ce^{144} originally present in the sample, (2) Ce^{144} in the re-agents used, (3) some or all of X, and (4) some or all of Z (as we shall call non-cerium activities contributed by the reagents which follow cerium chemistry; X and Z may or may not be the same). The second cerium separation may contain only (2) and (4). If so, obviously this is no measure of X. If a constant amount of X were to follow each cerium separation, then the second cerium frac-tion is a reasonable measure of the blank. But this is an unlikely occurrence, and this method does not provide an unambiguous blank determination.

If a small cross section is being measured in a charged-particle reaction, a satisfactory blank may frequently be determined by placing the target at a position beyond the range of the charged particle and isolating and measuring the activity of interest. The blank here includes contributions from reactions of long-range particles (usually neutrons) as well as from contaminants in tar-get and reagents. Fung and Turkevich[34] have discussed at some length the pre-cautions they have taken to insure an authentic measurement of the very small cross section for the $Cu^{65}(p,p\pi^+)Ni^{65}$ reaction. A similar discussion is given by Metzger and Miller[82] for the reactions induced by secondary charged particles produced by the interaction of high-energy protons with gold. The formation cross sections of bismuth and lead nuclides were very much less than a micro-barn. The blank problem in studies of bismuth fission has been described by Fairhall[28] and by Sugihara et al.[109]

4

At ordinary levels of activity, small amounts of radiochemical impurities are frequently tolerable if their half-lives are substantially different from that of the nuclide to be measured. In the low-level case, this is less true. For example, a great many laboratories are determining Sr^{90} at low levels in samples of geochemical or biochemical importance. All of the methods used involve the measurement of the 64-hour Y^{90} in secular equilibrium with its parent. One might think that a small amount of a long-lived activity would be of only minor consequence in such a determination since the amount of Y^{90} can be deduced from the resolution of the decay curve. In fact, however, counting statistics are not so good since in the resolution, the sum of the counter background and long-lived activity must be subtracted from each measured point. In effect, the counter background has been increased, defeating the purpose of the elaborate shielding methods used to achieve a low counter background. An obvious point to be made is that design of procedures of minimum blank is as important as engineering low backgrounds.

Blanks, like counter backgrounds, are usually not zero; at best they usually have small positive values even though statistically they may be taken to be zero. Such a blank is of course satisfactory. In less fortunate cases, the blank may not be negligibly small and yet not large enough to apply the usual nuclear identification methods such as pulse analysis or absorption curves. Thus one does not know how to change his procedure to remove the contaminating nuclide or nuclides. In such cases a standard practice is to determine the blank as a function of the chemical yield of the substance counted. If the relationship is simple and reproducible, a blank correction is readily applied to an actual sample (sacrificing some precision, of course). If not, the procedure must be altered (according to the intuition of the radiochemist) until either a negligible or small and constant blank is obtained.

5

Reducing the Blank Correction

The general problem of obtaining a negligible blank is a most complex one, and only a few statements can be made that are applicable to a wide variety of systems. There are two aspects to the problem. One is concerned with the removal of contaminating activities present in the sample or in the reagents not isotopic with the nuclide to be determined. The other involves the contribution from the reagents of nuclides isotopic or identical with that determined. The first is solved by good chemical separations; the second by proper choice of reagents.

1. Contamination of analytical reagents. A separate group of the NAS-NRC subcommittee on radiochemistry is pursuing this problem and no general discussion is presented here. In our laboratory we find many reagents whose activity is > 0.1 cpm per 10 mg. For example, a rare earth of high chemical purity such as 99.99% La_2O_3 may contain easily measurable amounts of Ac^{227}; Y_2O_3 and CeO_2 frequently are contaminated with thorium, but we have not been able to detect Ce^{144} in reagent cerium compounds. Barium salts usually contain measurable amounts of radium isotopes. Reagent cesium salts are inevitably contaminated with K^{40} and Rb^{87}. Honda[54] has recently found that reagents containing chlorine or sulfur also contain measurable amounts of P^{32}, produced by cosmic-ray interactions. At sea level, the saturation P^{32} activity is 0.22 dpm per kg as chlorine in HCl or CCl_4 and 0.46 dpm per kg as sulfur in H_2SO_4. Reagents stored (for a time long compared to the half-life of P^{32}) at a location of the order of a mile above sea level should contain about three times as much P^{32} activity. Thus considerable care needs to be exercised in the choice of reagents for very low-level determinations of P^{32}, P^{33}, or S^{35}. The latter two nuclides are also produced by cosmic rays in chlorine- or sulfur-containing reagents.

2. Obviously potassium salts and reagents of other elements which have

naturally occurring activities should be excluded from a procedure if the counting method is sensitive to the natural activity.

3. Aqueous solutions should be prepared with deionized water or water that has been distilled from a glass still. This is especially important for solutions used near the end of a low-level procedure. The activity found in ordinary distilled water, as prepared in the usual metal still, varies widely and may be negligible in some laboratories. A very rough rule of thumb is that if the ordinary distilled water has a measurable blank when titrated with EDTA or when used in trace-element colorimetry, it is probably not safe to use in a low-level method.

4. Frequently the major contribution to the blank is made in the last step. Consider the case of isolating Cs^{137}. A number of methods capable of separating cesium from Rb^{87} and K^{40} are known.[20,107] Suppose such a method is used, and a very clean cesium-containing solution is obtained. Let us assume that a solid cesium sample is desired for counting. The magnitude of the blank may depend very critically on the choice of precipitant among perchlorate, chloroplatinate, silicotungstate or tetraphenylborate. There are essentially no reliable rules that can be used at this point. Heavy-metal-containing reagents are usually avoided; yet in our experience[20] chloroplatinate appears to be superior to perchlorate.

5. Airborne contamination. Many radiochemical procedures require suction filtration in the final step to deposit a precipitate on filter paper for subsequent determination. A number of investigators have pointed out that a substantial amount of a 30-40 minute beta activity (several cpm) is readily collected on a filter by drawing a few liters of air through it.[16,79] This effect is large when the humidity is high. The activity in question is probably a complex mixture of the daughters of Rn^{222}. There appears also to be

a long-lived activity (believed to be Pb^{212} and its daughters[54]) whose contribution is of the order of 5 - 10% of that of the short-lived activity at the time the air stream is stopped. Thus it is of some importance to exclude the air contribution to the reagent blank. Methods that have been used include:

(a) Avoid suction filtration completely. This is certainly possible in procedures in which speed is of little consequence. Evaporation may often be used instead.

(b) Prefilter the air that eventually passes over the sample with a high-efficiency filter such as Millipore HA. This method is perhaps only 90% efficient even if several such filters are used.[79]

(c) Purify the air by a series of traps designed specifically to remove radon and its decay products. Usually a trap containing an aqueous solution and one with charcoal at dry-ice temperature are adequate.

6. Use of non-isotopic carriers. Frequently the inert carrier for a nuclide to be isolated is difficult to obtain free of active contaminants. In such a case a non-isotopic carrier of suitable chemical characteristics may be much more desirable from the point of view of reagent blanks. To illustrate this point, consider the case of determining Sr^{90} in geochemical samples. In the usual chemical procedure inert strontium carrier is added and the strontium is finally recovered in a form free of other activities (except other strontium nuclides).[78] The final strontium sample is allowed to stand for a time long enough to allow 64-hour Y^{90} to grow into secular equilibrium. Yttrium carrier is added and a yttrium fraction free of strontium is recovered and counted. The point here is that low-blank yttrium carrier is difficult to obtain; in general it must be chromatographed under conditions in which separation from thorium is substantially complete. This is tedious and unnecessary.

A much simpler technique is to isolate Y^{90} carrier-free by coprecipitation on ferric hydroxide.[107] The Fe(III) carrier used is very simply obtained in a form that gives a zero blank. Prepare an HCl solution of reagent iron wire or powder. Because of air oxidation there is always an appreciable concentration of Fe(III) in the $FeCl_2$ solution. Thus if the pH is adjusted to ~ 4, some $Fe(OH)_3$ will precipitate. The $Fe(OH)_3$ purifies the $FeCl_2$ solution by the usual scavenging action. A trace of H_2O_2 may be added if the scavenging is to be repeated. Finally, excess H_2O_2 is added and the Fe(II) is oxidized to Fe(III).

One might object to using Fe(III) as a carrier for yttrium because of the lack of specificity of $Fe(OH)_3$. On the other hand, if the strontium sample has been properly purified, no activity other than Y^{90} is present which would be carried on $Fe(OH)_3$. The coprecipitation of carrier-free yttrium and rare earths on $Fe(OH)_3$ is quantitative.[107] Furthermore, since small amounts of $Fe(OH)_3$ are recovered quantitatively on a Millipore filter, no chemical yield determination is necessary. Repeated application of this method to a standard Sr^{90}-containing solution has shown that the Y^{90} recovery is reproducible and indeed quantitative.[107]

7. Reuse of ion exchangers. Ion-exchange resins are commonly used in low-level radiochemical procedures. Some authors[80] have stated that a given batch of resin should not be used more than once in a low-level separation. Several metal ions which are strongly adsorbed by ion exchangers are erratically eluted and their reuse may lead to contamination of subsequent samples. On the other hand, repeated use of the same colloidal Dowex-50 in rare-earth separations[107] has caused no difficulty. In the latter case, a basic citrate wash has been used in between runs. According to Harley,[47] some batches of Dowex-50 have been found to contain Sr^{90}. The activity is in a form that is not removed by the usual acid-base washing cycles. It is apparent only when the resin

9

is ashed and counted; that is, samples are not contaminated when the resin is used in the usual column or batch manner. The activity level is about 10 dpm Sr^{90} per 100 ml of wet resin.

8. Equipment and facilities. There are obvious complications in attempting to do low-level work in a laboratory devoted otherwise to ordinary levels of activity, particularly if others work with the same nuclide as that being measured at a low level. A very strict segregation of the usual laboratory glassware, hardware, and counting and other equipment (such as counters, absorbers, balances, ovens, centrifuges, etc.) is highly important. While not demonstrable that it is absolutely necessary, in the author's laboratory, polyethylene ware is used where possible. It is conceivable that potassium and perhaps other naturally occurring activities can be leached from glass.

Identifying Nuclides in Low-Level Determinations

In many low-level determinations involving long-lived fallout nuclides, naturally occurring or cosmic-ray-induced activities, the counting measurement shows only that a certain amount of activity has been observed. If a properly determined blank correction is known, the difference should be attributable to the nuclide being investigated. How can one be sure that the activity measured is that which one expects it to be?

Only in a few fortunate cases such as Si^{32}, Sr^{90}, or Ac^{227}, which have daughter activities of convenient half-life, is it possible to base the identification on a decay curve. In most cases there is no appreciable decay over the time of the experiment. Pulse analysis of gamma rays does not appear to be feasible in general for a few dpm of activity, at least at the present level of sophistication of instrumentation. A unique identification of low-level positron emitters is made possible by the angular correlation of annihilation radiation.[5,21]

Nuclides decaying by electron capture or isomeric transition can frequently be identified at low levels by x-ray counting.

A standard chemical method used is to recycle to constant specific activity. From the constancy the chemical nature of the measured nuclide is deduced. Usually there is no difficulty in assigning the correct mass number. It is worth-while to point out, however, that constant specific activity is not necessarily adequate if the same chemical procedure is used in each cycle. This can be illustrated by an example. Suppose nuclide A, which is the nuclide being studied, is poorly or not at all separated from radionuclide B (a different chemical element) in the procedure used and thus the first sample of A contains some B. On recycling through the same procedure, A and B are not appreciably fractionated and thus virtually the same specific activity as before will be obtained even though the contamination level of B is appreciable. On the other hand, a different procedure which provides better fractionation between A and B should show a change in specific activity. Pairs of elements like rubidium and cesium which are very similar chemically may cause this kind of difficulty. Generally speaking then, rather different chemical procedures should be used in successive cycles in the process of recycling to constant specific activity.

In the case of beta emitters, absorption curves may be taken to help iden-tify the nuclide. But with say only 0.5 cpm of activity against a background of 0.2 cpm, the absorption characteristics cannot be measured very precisely. On the other hand, usually all one needs to know is that the absorption curve is consistent with what one expects. The parameter compared is normally the half-thickness or sometimes the general (unresolved) shape of the absorption curve. When working with thick samples of low specific activity, Libby and co-workers[77,106,110] have used with considerable success a close cylindrical geom-etry among sample, absorber, and counter. Under these conditions a simple beta

11

emitter exhibits a truly exponential absorption curve, and a measured half-thickness can be correlated with beta energy in a straightforward way.

Radiochemists who are accustomed to working at much higher levels may suggest that a measured absorption curve on a low-level sample of, say, Cs^{137} should be compared with that measured under the same conditions with an authentic (and much higher activity) sample of Cs^{137}. The reaction of most low-level radiochemists is that under no circumstances would they want, say, 1000 or even 100 dpm of Cs^{137} measured on a counter intended for 1 dpm.

Absorption curves are usually taken with plastic absorbers since they are generally uncontaminated. Aluminum and other metals frequently have an appreciable blank correction. Polyethylene and Mylar have been used successfully in several laboratories.[10,80,107] A disadvantage to working with plastic absorbers is that it is easy to build up an appreciable electrostatic charge on them by rubbing with tissue, as one might do in cleaning them. The charge will leak off gradually, and the effect is readily observable as an increased counting rate on a beta counter with a thin wall. It has been the practice in our laboratory to place the absorber over the sample several hours before a count is taken and thereafter avoid handling the absorber until the count is complete.

Relationship Between Ordinary and Low-Level Procedures

Generally speaking, a procedure designated as suitable for low-level use may be very similar to those used at much higher levels, as will be seen in the procedures described at the end of this review. Usually decontamination steps are repeated more times and extra care is exercised to maximize yield, since reducing the chemical yield is tantamount to increasing background. In a statistical sense the effect is still greater since the figure of merit for a method depends on (sample activity)^2/(background rate).

Particular attention is paid to specificity since a low-level separation

frequently starts with a very large amount of sample, containing nearly all possible contaminants. It is not easy to decide what holdback carriers to use in each step of the procedure. Thus a low-level procedure for nuclide A will often contain a step that is known to be specific for A in the presence of B, C, D, ... when the latter are present carrier-free. Methods most successful for such steps are ion exchange, solvent extraction and volatilization which are applicable at very low concentrations.

Seldom, if ever, is a low-level procedure done carrier-free if the element exists in stable form. Because of extra decontamination or other steps that tend to reduce yields, somewhat larger amounts of carrier are used than in work at ordinary levels. In the low-level determination of nuclides such as Pm^{147} for which no stable isotope is available, non-isotopic carriers have been used (in this case neodymium and samarium).[107]

Some General Rules

The following general rules are suggested to aid in the design of a low-level procedure:

1. Devise a fast and efficient first step to remove the nuclide of interest from the bulk of the sample (frequently very large). Poor decontamination from other nuclides in this first step is perfectly acceptable. Since samples may be rocks, meteorites, sea water, earth, cyclotron targets, etc., little specific advice can be offered.

2. List all possible activities that might be present in the sample at levels that would interfere with the determination. Introduce appropriate holdback carriers and scavenging agents to take care of each extraneous activity. All radiochemical procedures do this to a greater or lesser extent.

3. Devise a step that is highly specific for the nuclide in question. This is

13

in general always possible if appropriate preliminary removal of interferences can be carried out.

4. Isolate the sample in a form suitable for counting, being very careful that any reagents (including water and other solvents) used in the last step are free of activity. Filtered air may be necessary. Contamination from reagents introduced in earlier steps may be removed in the high-specificity operation. The choice of final form is often a compromise between low blank and suitable gravimetric factor. For a soft beta emitter the total weight of counting sample should be minimized, of course.

5. If the chemical yield of the procedure is reasonable, determine a blank as described earlier, taking care to ensure that an authentic blank is measured. If it is not negligible, introduce additional steps in the procedure, and repeat until the blank is satisfactorily small.

6. Isolate the active nuclide according to your procedure from a real sample. If counted as an external sample on a beta counter, determine the absorption curve (if long-lived) and compare it with what one expects for the nuclide. If the nuclide is sufficiently short-lived, follow the decay until the activity no longer changes appreciably with time. The residual activity is a lower limit to the blank. On a gamma counter a decay curve may be followed in the same way and possibly with a low-background, highly stable scintillation spectrometer, pulse analysis can be used to check purity and authenticity.

7. Put the sample (if long-lived) back into solution and go through a second processing cycle, using in step 3 a different operation specific for the nuclide. Remeasure the specific activity. If there is no change, the chances are that the procedure is adequate.

8. In general the blank must be redetermined whenever a different batch of reagents is used. Hence if a procedure is to be applied to a large number

14

of samples, it is wise to stock a considerable inventory of reagents from the same batch. Blank determinations should be made periodically as a matter of course even with the same batch of reagents.

9. If a procedure is devised that appears to be satisfactory and it is to be used routinely for a large number of samples, it is frequently worthwhile investigating the possibility of eliminating some steps or reducing the number of times certain operations such as scavenging are to be repeated. In the long run a great deal of time may be saved. In general, low-level procedures tend to be over-conservative; that is, in one's attempt to make sure that a procedure will be satisfactory the first time he tries it, particularly from the point of view of a small blank, he usually includes more steps than are really necessary. Eliminating them may result not only in time saved but also higher chemical yield.

10. Libby,[75] who has pioneered in the use of low-level radiochemistry, points out in his Nobel lecture, with regard to the method used in radiocarbon dating, "It is something like the discipline of surgery - cleanliness, care, seriousness, and practice." No further comment seems necessary.

Examples of Low-Level Procedures

Several examples of low-level procedures, chosen for their variety of elements isolated as well as of starting material, will be described below. Experimental details such as volumes and concentrations of reagents have been omitted.

1. Potassium from iron meteorites[50]

In this study Honda[50] measured the amount of cosmogenic K^{40} in certain iron meteorites, as produced by the spallation of iron with cosmic rays. The measurement consists essentially of determining the specific activity of a potassium fraction isolated from the meteorites (samples weighing between 170 and 1100 grams) and comparing it with the specific activity of natural potassium,

15

which fortunately has a low concentration in iron meteorites (about 0.1 ppm).

Obviously no potassium carrier could be added. In one of the samples, purified cesium carrier was used. After solution of the meteorite in aqua regia, iron, cobalt, copper and other elements were removed by ether extraction and anion exchange. The resultant solution was made ammoniacal and filtered. The filtrate which contained about 3 moles of NH_4Cl and 0.7 moles of $Ni(NH_3)_4^{++}$ was passed through a cation-exchange column in ammonium form. Potassium and cesium were eluted with ammoniacal ammonium acetate, and the alkali metals were precipitated with tetraphenylborate in the presence of EDTA. Potassium and cesium were separated on Dowex-50 and $K(C_6H_5)_4B$ precipitated. The chemical yield of potassium (85%) was estimated from the cesium recovery. The actual weight of potassium recovered was evidently much more than that originally in the meteorite, the excess being attributed to the contribution of potassium by reagents and equipment.

The specific activity of the sample was determined, and it was then dissolved in an acetone-water mixture and passed through a cation exchanger. Potassium was eluted with HCl. This fraction was then subjected to scavenging with CuS and $Fe(OH)_3$. The tetraphenylborate was again precipitated. The specific activity was essentially the same for the first and second counting samples and considerably higher than that of a natural potassium sample.

The net beta counting rates due to K^{40} were in the range 0.3 to 2.4 cpm (background 0.17 cpm). While no specific reference is made to contaminants (other than non-cosmogenic potassium), it is clear from the procedure that rubidium is about the only conceivable interference and the latter should be removed in the cation-exchange steps. The ratio of K^{40} to K^{39} and K^{41}, as deduced from the specific activity measurements, was subsequently verified mass spectrometrically.

16

2. Barium and strontium nuclides in spontaneous fission[49] of U^{238}

Kuroda and co-workers[11,49,69,86] have measured the yields of a number of nuclides in the spontaneous fission of U^{238}. The paper by Hey-degger and Kuroda[49] is devoted chiefly to measuring the yield of Ba^{140} al-though mention is made also of Sr^{91} and Sr^{92}. Since the spontaneous fission half-life of U^{238} is very long (8×10^{15} years), very large samples of uranium compounds (500-2000 grams) must be taken as the starting material to obtain measurable counting rates of fission products.

The uranium was dissolved in ether, and the solution was extracted twice with small volumes of aqueous barium nitrate solution. Barium sulfate was pre-cipitated, filtered, and converted to the carbonate by fusion with sodium car-bonate. The barium was then purified by ferric hydroxide scavenging, by pre-cipitation as barium nitrate, and finally precipitated as the carbonate or chromate. A barium sample isolated from 10 grams of uranium showed no activity above the counter background of 1.10 ± 0.03 cpm.

When barium was isolated from 758 grams of U^{238}, 1.11 ± 0.15 cpm of Ba^{140} was found when counted 410 minutes after the $BaSO_4$ precipitation step. The ob-served decay curve was found to fit the calculated growth-decay curve of Ba^{140} - La^{140}.

When three nitrate precipitation and five ferric hydroxide scavenging steps are used, the authors state that there remains 0.06 ± 0.03 cpm of residual con-tamination, determined presumably by following the decay over a period long com-pared to the half-life of 12.8-day Ba^{140}. Another method of determining the blank would be to separate barium again from the uranium solution, very soon after the first extraction. Little Ba^{140} would have formed by spontaneous fission in a time very short compared to 12.8 days.

Similar experiments were conducted with uranium that had been depleted in

17

U^{235}, reducing the possibility of induced fission contributing to the observed results. In this case the residual contamination was 0.15 $\pm$ 0.05 cpm. The authors speculate that this may be ascribed to radium contamination.

3. Cobalt and iron from copper cyclotron target[95]

Roy and Kohman[95] were interested in establishing the nuclear characteristics of Fe^{60} which was believed to be long-lived. Beta-decay systematics predict that it should decay, at least in part, to 10-min. Co^{60m}. The experiment consisted of first recovering an iron fraction from a copper target that had been irradiated with about 200 μa-hours of 400-Mev protons. The copper target, weighing about 10 grams, was dissolved in HNO_3 and the solution was evaporated to dryness and taken up in HCl. Carriers for Ca, Sc, Ti, V, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, and Zn were added and $FeCl_3$ was extracted into isopropyl ether under conditions that are essentially specific for iron. The iron fraction after purification contained of the order of a millicurie of Fe^{59} and a considerable quantity of Fe^{55}.

The second part of the chemical procedure consisted of milking Co^{60m} from the iron fraction. This was done by contacting an aqueous cobalt solution briefly with the solution of $FeCl_3$ in isopropyl ether. The cobalt fraction was then washed with isopropyl ether several times. Cobalt was finally precipitated as the sulfide. Prefiltered air was found to be necessary to eliminate short-lived radioelements in air. The separation took about 9-15 minutes.

Counting was done on a thin-window beta counter sensitive to the 51-Kev conversion electrons of Co^{60m}. The background was 2.8 cpm. Residual long-lived activity (presumably Fe^{55} + Fe^{59}) ranged in various separations from 9 to 55 cpm. The net rate attributable to Co^{60m} at the time of separation ranged from 9 to 62 cpm. This illustrates the difficulties associated with removing a few dpm of an activity from a system containing millicuries of other activities,

18

particularly when only a few minutes may be devoted to the separation because of a short half-life.

4. Cerium and promethium from sea water[107]

The fallout nuclides 285-day Ce^{144} and 2.6-year Pm^{147} may be used as tracers in marine geochemical studies.[108] The chemical separation method from sea water and the radiochemical detection of the two nuclides have been described.[107]

The initial concentration of the rare earth nuclides from sea water of volumes in the range 50-200 liters was accomplished by coprecipitation on $Fe(OH)_3$. Relatively large amounts of precipitant (carrier or scavenger) are necessary to remove rare earths quantitatively (at least 20 mg and preferably more) from these large volumes. Since large amounts of cerium or other rare earth carrier might complicate the counting process, and since the use of $Fe(OH)_3$ results in no loss in efficiency, the latter was chosen. A great many contaminating activities are expected to follow in this step.

The $Fe(OH)_3$ was dissolved in HCl; cerium, neodymium, and samarium carriers were added; and the solution was passed through an anion exchanger which adsorbs iron, the rare earths passing through. Other anion-exchange steps in HCl and H_2SO_4 removed uranium, protactinium, and thorium. Scavenging with $BaSO_4$ removed radium and lead. The final separation of cerium, neodymium, promethium, and samarium was made on a cation exchanger with ammonium lactate as the eluent. This step was designed to eliminate actinium contamination. The mean yield of neodymium and samarium was taken to be the chemical yield of promethium. For counting purposes the promethium was carried on samarium oxalate. The samarium carrier, which was added to the promethium fraction from the column, had been purified sufficiently to give a zero blank.

Counting rates observed have been as small as 0.1 cpm for Pm^{147} to as

19

much as 15 cpm for Ce^{144} on a counter whose background is about 0.2 cpm. The nuclides have been identified by absorption curves and by recycling to constant specific activity. The decay of one of the early Ce^{144} samples has been followed for about two years and the decay curve is consistent with a 285-day half-life. Determinations of blanks have shown repeatedly that reagents contribute less than 0.03 cpm.

5. Argon-39 and tritium from meteorites[29]

The chemical purification of gases for subsequent low-level determination is rather different from the procedures described above. Fireman and DeFelice[29] have described the methods used in isolating, purifying, and counting Ar^{39} and H^3. Cosmic-ray exposure ages are estimated from the results.

Separations were made from both iron and stone meteorites in the weight range 17 to 50 grams. Contamination from terrestrial air and water was removed by pumping at room temperature and at $300^{\circ}C$. The meteorite samples were melted by an induction furnace in the presence of carrier argon and in some cases carrier hydrogen. Hydrogen was first separated from the gases evolved. For most of the iron meteorites, adequate separation was achieved simply by letting the hydrogen diffuse through a hot palladium thimble.

In the case of stone meteorites, which in general contained much more hydrogen, the evolved gas mixture was passed over a Cu-CuO furnace, oxidizing hydrogen to water. The latter and other condensable substances were frozen in a cold trap at liquid nitrogen temperature. Carbon dioxide was removed by raising the trap temperature to $-60^{\circ}C$. Water was reduced to hydrogen with hot magnesium amalgam. The final purification step for hydrogen was diffusion through a hot palladium thimble.

After hydrogen had been removed, the remaining gas was brought into contact with zirconium ribbon at $1200^{\circ}C$, which reacts with essentially all except

the inert gases. The remainder was adsorbed on charcoal at -196°C, and argon was removed by raising the charcoal temperature to -60°C. The argon was subjected to one more treatment with hot zirconium before being counted.

The gas counters used ranged in volume from 2.1 cm^3 (background 4.2 ± 0.2 counts per hour) to 80 cm^3 (background 56 ± 2 counts per hour). The counting mixture used in the case of the tritium determination was 10 cm hydrogen, 3 cm butene, and 30 cm argon. For argon counting it was 5 cm butene and 50 cm argon. Counter background was measured with tank hydrogen-butene-argon or butene-argon at the same pressures.

While no blank measurements are reported as such, it would appear that the procedures are probably adequate. The method of determination of counter background automatically includes any contribution of impurities from the carrier gases and the gases used to obtain a suitable counting mixture. Among other samples, the Carbo and Canyon Diablo meteorites gave negative results for both Ar^{39} and H^3. In fact most of the iron meteorites contained no detectable H^3. From these negative results one concludes that the procedures used were satisfactory from the point of view of a blank.

Survey of Low-Level Procedures

In Table I are listed references to procedures, published and unpublished, of two kinds: those which are claimed by the authors to be low-level ones (defined differently by different authors), and those which this author feels may have been essentially low-level although no specific mention has been made in the paper. Since a procedure that is satisfactory for one system may be very inadequate for another, the separation schemes suggested in the references of Table I are useful only as guides. As pointed out earlier, a comprehensive survey of low-level procedures is not possible in principle; the references cited should be considered only to be typical.

21

Element	Environmental Samples	Natural Waters	Sediments	Rocks, Minerals	Meteorites	Irradiated Targets	Mixed Fission Products
H		63			29,37	51	
Be	72	9,39,80	10,80		26,52,53	17,51	30
C	6,74,89	32					
Na					53	51,93	
Mg						60,96	
Al					5,26,52,53	51,93	
Si			71		53	60,96	
P	72	76	71			60	
S	72	38					
Cl		99,119		22,64,68	52,53	51,60	
Ar					29,114		
K					37,50,52,53	51	
Ca					53		
Sc					53	60	
Ti					53		
V				101	53	60	
Cr				102	53	23,96	
Mn					52,53	23,51,60, 79	
Fe						60	
Co					26,53	23,60,95	
Ni					53	23,34	109
Cu				102		23	109
Zn						23	28,106,109

Starting Material[b]

Table I (cont.)

Element	Environmental Samples	Natural Waters	Sediments	Rocks, Minerals	Meteorites	Irradiated Targets	Mixed Fission Products
Ga						23	28,109
Ge				102			28
As				102		105	28,106,109
Se							28
Br						105	28,100,109
Kr		3					
Rb				19,31	19	105	109
Sr	42,70,78,81, 83,112	107		49		105	28,103
Y						105	28,44
Zr							28
Mo				86,101			28,92,103
Tc				4			
Ru	81					40,105	28,103
Rh						40	
Pd						40,118	28,103
Ag						118	28,92
Cd				77		118	100,103
In				77		118	
Sn						118	28
Sb				101,102		118	28,103
Te				101		118	28,103
I				11			103
Cs	81	20,61,107 120,121		19	19		103

Table I (cont.)

Element	Environmental Samples	Natural Waters	Sediments	Rocks, Minerals	Meteorites	Irradiated Targets	Mixed Fission Products
Ba		115		49,69	46,90	105	28,103
La				101			44
Ce	81	107					103
Pm		107					
Re				85			
Hg					27,91		
Tl					27,90	82	
Pb				2,25,45	90	58,82,117	
Bi				2	27,90	82	
Rn		67					
Fr				73			
Ra		13,43,94, 116					
Th		65,97	41	113			
Pa				2			
U		94			46,90		
Pu						55	

a As indicated in the text, these references used or appeared to have used low-level separation methods in the applications indicated.

b The seven categories are obviously not mutually exclusive. Each reference is listed in the category that appears most descriptive. Meteorites are irradiated in activation analysis; here they are listed under "Meteorites." Mixed fission products are, of course, found in many irradiated targets; a separate category appeared to be useful, however For lack of a better category, ordinary reagents are listed under "Rocks, Minerals."

REFERENCES

1. B. W. Agranoff, "Silica Vials Improve Low-Level Counting," Nucleonics $\underline{15}$, no. 10, 106 (1957).

2. G. Alberti, C. Bettinali, F. Salvetti, and S. Santoli, "Rapid Method for Uranium Determination in Rocks by Radiometric Measurement of Pa^{234} in Equilibrium with Extracted Th^{234}," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (United Nations, Geneva, 1958), Vol. 3, p. 565.

3. S. Amiel and L. Winsberg, "A Possible Geochemical Application of Kr^{85}," J. Nuclear Energy $\underline{5}$, 50 (1957).

4. E. Anders, R. N. Sen Sarma, and P. H. Kato, "Search for Tc^{98} by Neutron Activation Analysis," J. Chem. Phys. $\underline{24}$, 622 (1956).

5. E. Anders, "The Record in Meteorites: II. On the Presence of Al^{26} in Meteorites and Tektites," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta $\underline{19}$, 53 (1960).

6. E. C. Anderson and W. F. Libby, "Natural Radiocarbon from Cosmic Radiation," Phys. Rev. $\underline{72}$, 931 (1947).

7. E. C. Anderson and F. N. Hayes, "Recent Advances in Low-Level Counting Techniques," Annual Review of Nuclear Science (Annual Reviews, Inc., Palo Alto, California, 1956), Vol. 6, p. 303.

8. J. R. Arnold, "Scintillation Counting of Natural Radiocarbon. I. The Counting Method," Science $\underline{119}$, 155 (1954).

9. J. R. Arnold and H. A. Al-Salih, "Beryllium-7 Produced by Cosmic Rays," Science $\underline{121}$, 451 (1956).

10. J. R. Arnold, "Beryllium-10 Produced by Cosmic Rays," Science $\underline{124}$, 584 (1956).

11. F. T. Ashizawa and P. K. Kuroda, "Occurrence of Short-Lived Iodine Isotopes in Natural and in Depleted Uranium Salts," J. Inorg. and Nuclear Chem. 5, 12 (1957).

12. G. W. Barendsen, "Low-Level Counting of Beta Emitters," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (United Nations, Geneva, 1958), Vol. 3, Paper 554.

13. F. B. Barker and L. L. Thatcher, "Modified Determination of Radium in Water," Anal. Chem. 29, 1573 (1957).

14. E. R. Bauminger and S. G. Cohen, "Natural Radioactivity of V^{50} and Ta^{180}," Phys. Rev. 110, 953 (1958).

15. C. G. Bell, Jr. and F. N. Hayes, ed., Liquid Scintillation Counting (Pergamon Press, New York, 1958).

16. A. Z. Belousov, Yu. V. Novikov, V. F. Oreshko, and B. I. Polivoda, "Radioactivity of Atmospheric Air Due to Aerosols," Gigiena i Sanit. 23, 17 (1958), Nuclear Sci. Abs. 23, 2693 (1959).

17. G. H. Bouchard and A. W. Fairhall, "Production of Be^{7} in 30-42 Mev Alpha Irradiation of Oxygen, Aluminum, and Copper," Phys, Rev. 116, 160 (1959).

18. F. E. Butler, "Determination of Tritium in Water and Urine. Liquid Scintillation Counting and Rate-of-Drift Determination," Anal. Chem. 33, 409 (1961).

19. M. J. Cabell and A. A. Smales, "Determination of Rubidium and Cesium in Rocks, Minerals, and Meteorites by Neutron Activation Analysis," Analyst 82, 390 (1957).

20. H. L. Caron and T. T. Sugihara, "Annual Progress Report Contract AT(30-1)-1930," U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Report NYO-7759 (1959).

21. J. B. Cumming and R. Hoffman, "Efficient Low-Level Counting System for C^{11}," Rev. Sci. Inst. 29, 1104 (1958).

22. R. Davis, Jr. and O. A, Schaeffer, "Chlorine-36 in Nature," Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 62, 105 (1955).

23. R. J. Debs, J. T. Eisinger, A. W. Fairhall, I. Halpern, and H. G. Richter, "Yields of Photonuclear Reactions with 320-Mev X-Rays. I. Experimental Results," Phys. Rev. 97, 1325 (1955).

24. H. DeVries, "Contribution of Neutrons to the Background of Counters Used for C^{14} Age Measurements," Nuclear Phys. $\underline{1}$, 477 (1956).

25. W. R. Eckelmann, W. S. Broecker, and J. L. Kulp, "Half-Life of Pb^{210}," Phys. Rev. $\underline{118}$, 698 (1960).

26. W. D. Ehmann and T. P. Kohman, "Cosmic-Ray-Induced Radioactivities in Meteorites. I. Chemical Procedures: Al, Be, Co," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta $\underline{14}$, 340 (1958).

27. W. D. Ehmann and J. R. Huizenga, "Bismuth, Thallium and Mercury in Stone Meteorites by Activation Analysis," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta $\underline{17}$, 125 (1959).

28. A. W. Fairhall, "Fission of Bismuth with 15- and 22-Mev Deuterons," Phys. Rev. $\underline{102}$, 1335 (1956).

29. E. L. Fireman and J. DeFelice, "Argon-39 and Tritium in Meteorites," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta $\underline{18}$, 183 (1960).

30. K. F. Flynn, L. E. Glendenin, and E. P. Steinberg, "Search for Be^{10} as a Product of Ternary Fission," Phys. Rev. $\underline{101}$, 1492 (1956).

31. K. F. Flynn and L. E. Glendenin, "Half-Life and Beta Spectrum of Rb^{87}," Phys. Rev. $\underline{116}$, 744 (1959).

32. S. Fonselius and G. Ostlund, "Natural Radiocarbon Measurements in Surface Water from the North Atlantic and Arctic Oceans," Tellus $\underline{11}$, 77 (1959).

33. A. J. Freedman and E. C. Anderson, "Low-Level Counting Techniques," Nucleonics $\underline{10}$, no. 8, 57 (1952).

34. S. C. Fung and A. Turkevich, "Radiochemical Evidence for the $Cu^{65}(p,p\,\pi^{+})$ Ni^{65} Reaction," Phys. Rev. $\underline{95}$, 176 (1954).

35. J. Geiss and C. Gfeller, "Special Low-Level Counters," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, (United Nations, Geneva, 1958), Vol. 3, Paper 236.

36. R. N. Glover and D. E. Watt, "Lanthanum-138 Activity," Phil. Mag. $\underline{48}$, 49 (1957).

37. K. Goebel, P. Schmidlin, and J. Zahringer, "T-He^{3} and K-A^{40} Age of Ramsdorf," Z. Naturforsch. $\underline{14a}$, 996 (1959).

38. P. S. Goel, "Radioactive Sulfur Produced by Cosmic Rays in Rain Water," Nature 178, 1458 (1956).

39. P. S. Goel, S. Jha, D. Lal, P. Radhakrishna, and Rama, "Cosmic-Ray Produced Beryllium Isotopes in Rain," Nuclear Phys. 1, 196 (1956).

40. W. Goishi and W. F. Libby, "Negative-Pion Activation of Silver," Phys. Rev. 104, 1717 (1956).

41. E. D. Goldberg and M. Koide, "Ionium-Thorium Chronology in Deep-Sea Sediments of the Pacific," Science 128, 1003 (1958).

42. A. S. Goldin, R. J. Velten, and G. W. Frishkorn, "Determination of Radioactive Strontium," Anal. Chem. 31, 1490 (1959).

43. A. S. Goldin, "Determination of Dissolved Radium," Anal. Chem. 33, 406 (1961).

44. W. E. Grummitt and G. M. Milton, "Independent Yields of La^{140}, Y^{90} and Y^{91} in Thermal-Neutron Fission of U^{235} and U^{233}," J. Inorg. and Nuclear Chem. 5, 93 (1957).

45. H. R. von Gunten, W. Buser, and F. G. Houtermans, "Determination of Extreme Th/U Ratios in Minerals," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (United Nations, Geneva, 1958), Vol. 2, p. 239.

46. H. Hamaguchi, G. Reed, and A. Turkevich, "Uranium and Barium in Stone Meteorites," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta 12, 337 (1957).

47. J. H. Harley, Health and Safety Laboratory, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, private communication (1961).

48. R. H. Herber, T. T. Sugihara, C. D. Coryell, W. E. Bennett, and J. R. Huizenga, "Probable Absence of K-Capture in the Decay of Lead-205," Phys. Rev. 103, 955 (1956).

49. H. R. Heydegger and P. K. Kuroda, "Natural Occurrence of Short-Lived Barium and Strontium," J. Inorg. and Nuclear Chem. 12, 12 (1959).

50. M. Honda, "Cosmogenic K^{40} in Iron Meteorites," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta 17, 148 (1959).

51. M. Honda and D. Lal, "Some Cross Sections for the Production of Radio-

nuclides in the Bombardment of Carbon, Nitrogen, Oxygen, and Iron by Medium-Energy Protons," Phys. Rev. 118, 1618 (1960).

52. M. Honda, J. P. Shedlovsky, and J. R. Arnold, "Radioactive Species Produced by Cosmic Rays in Iron Meteorites ," Geochim. et Cosmochim. 22, 133 (1961).

53. M. Honda and J. R. Arnold, "Radioactive Species Produced by Cosmic Rays in Aroos Iron Meteorite," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta (in press, 1961).

54. M. Honda, University of California, San Diego, private communication (1961).

55. D. L. Horrocks and M.H. Studier, "Low Level Plutonium-241 Analysis by Liquid Scintillation Techniques," Anal. Chem. 30, 1747 (1958).

56. D. L. Horrocks and M. H. Studier, "Determination of the Absolute Disintegration Rates of Low Energy Beta Emitters in a Liquid Scintillation Spectrometer," Anal. Chem. 33, 615 (1961).

57. F. Hosain, "Low-Level, Low-Energy, Low-Quantity Sample Counting in Tracer Work," Naturewissenschaften 45, 107 (1958).

58. J. R. Huizenga and J. Wing, "Long-Lived Pb^{205}," Phys. Rev. 102, 926 (1956).

59. W. H. Johnston, "Low-Level Counting Methods for Isotopic Tracers," Science 124, 801 (1956).

60. J. W. Jones, "Spallation Yields from Chlorine with 45-430 Mev Protons," U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Report NYO-6627 (1956).

61. B. Kahn, D. K. Smith, and C. P. Straub, "Determination of Low Concentrations of Radioactive Cesium in Water," Anal. Chem. 29, 1210 (1957).

62. M. I. Kalkstein and W. F. Libby, "An Investigation of the Double-Beta Decay of Sn^{124}," Phys. Rev. 85, 368 (1952).

63. S. Kaufman and W. F. Libby, "The Natural Distribution of Tritium," Phys. Rev. 93, 1337 (1954).

64. B. T. Kenna and P. K. Kuroda, "Ratio of Induced Fission to Spontaneous Fission in Pitchblende and Natural Occurrence of Radiochlorine," J. Inorg. and Nuclear Chem. 16, 1 (1960).

65. F. F. Koczy, E. Picciotto, G. Poulaert, and S. Wilgain, "Measurement of Thorium Isotopes in Sea Water," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta 11, 103 (1957).

66. T. P. Kohman and N. Saito, "Radioactivity in Geology and Cosmology," _Annual Review of Nuclear Science_ (Annual Reviews, Inc., Palo Alto, Calif., 1954), Vol. 4, p. 401.

67. P. K. Kuroda, "Determination of Thoron in Mineral Waters," Anal. Chem. 25, 823 (1953).

68. P. K. Kuroda, R. R. Edwards, B. L. Robinson, J. H. Jonte, and C. Goolsby, "Chlorine-36 in Pitchblende," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta 11, 194 (1957).

69. P. K. Kuroda and R. R. Edwards, "Radiochemical Measurement of Natural Fission Rate of Uranium and Natural Occurrence of Ba^{140}," J. Inorg. and Nuclear Chem. 3, 345 (1957).

70. P. K. Kuroda, Argonne National Laboratory Report ANL-5829 (1958).

71. D. Lal, E. D. Goldberg, and M. Koide, "Cosmic-Ray-Produced Si^{32} in Nature and Its Geochemical Implications," Science 131, 332 (1960).

72. D. Lal, J. R. Arnold, and M. Honda, "Cosmic-Ray Production Rates of Be^{7} in Oxygen and P^{32}, P^{33}, and S^{35} in Argon at Mountain Altitudes," Phys. Rev. 118, 1626 (1960).

73. A. K. Lavrukhina, A. A. Posdnyakov, and S. S. Rodin, "Investigations of the Chemical Properties of Francium by Means of Fr^{212}," Intern. J. Appl. Radiation and Isotopes 9, 34 (1960).

74. W. F. Libby, _Radiocarbon Dating_, 2nd ed. (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1955).

75. W. F. Libby, "Radiocarbon Dating," Science 133, 621 (1961).

76. L. Marquez and N. L. Costa, "The Formation of P^{32} from Atmospheric Argon by Cosmic Rays," Nuovo Cimento 2, 1038 (1955).

77. E. A. Martell and W. F. Libby, "The Natural Radioactivity of In^{115}," Phys. Rev. 80, 977 (1950).

78. E. A. Martell, "The Chicago Sunshine Method," U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Report AECU-3262 (1956).

79. J. M. Matuszek, Jr. and T. T. Sugihara, "Low-Level Radiochemical Separation of Manganese," Anal. Chem. 33, 35 (1961).

80. J. R. Merrill, M. Honda, and J. R. Arnold, "Methods for Separation and

Determination of Beryllium in Sediments and Natural Waters," Anal. Chem. $\underline{32}$, 1420 (1960).

81. W. F. Merritt, "Radiochemical Analysis for Long-Lived Fission Products in Environmental Materials," Can. J. Chem. $\underline{36}$, 425 (1958).

82. A. E. Metzger and J. M. Miller, "Study of Thallium, Lead, and Bismuth Nuclei Produced in Bombardment of Gold with 380-Mev Protons," Phys. Rev. $\underline{113}$, 1125 (1959).

83. G. M. Milton and W. E. Grummitt, "Ion-Exchange Method for Quantitative Separation of Alkaline Earths and Their Application to the Determination of Sr^{90} in Milk Ash," Can. J. Chem. $\underline{35}$, 541 (1957).

84. A. Moljk, R. W. P. Drever, and S. C. Curran, "The Background of Counters and Radiocarbon Dating," Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) $\underline{A239}$, 433 (1957).

85. S. N. Naldrett and W. F. Libby, "The Natural Radioactivity of Rhenium," Phys. Rev. $\underline{73}$, 487 (1948).

86. P. L. Parker and P. K. Kuroda, "Molybdenum-99 in Uranium Salts and Spontaneous Fission Half-Life of U^{238}," J. Chem. Phys. $\underline{25}$, 1084 (1956).

87. R. P. Parker, "An Improved Anti-Coincidence Shield for Use in Low Background Counting," Nuclear Inst. and Methods $\underline{8}$, 339 (1960).

88. R. W. Pringle, W. Turchinetz, B. L. Funt, and S. S. Danyluk, "Radiocarbon Age Estimates Obtained by an Improved Liquid Scintillation Technique," Science $\underline{125}$, 69 (1957).

89. T. A. Rafter and G. J. Ferguson, "A-Bomb Effect - Recent Increase in C^{14} Content of Atmosphere and Biosphere," Science $\underline{126}$, 557 (1957).

90. G. W. Reed, K. Kigoshi, and A. Turkevich, "Activation Analysis for Heavy Elements in Stone Meteorites," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (United Nations, Geneva, 1958), Vol. 28, paper 953.

91. G. W. Reed, K. Kigoshi, and A. Turkevich, "Determination of Concentrations of Heavy Elements in Meteorites by Activation Analysis," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta $\underline{20}$, 122 (1960).

92. R. B. Regier, W. H. Burgus, and R. L. Trump, "Ratio of Asymmetric to Symmetric Fission of U^{233} As a Function of Neutron Energy," Phys. Rev. 113, 1589 (1959).

93. R. A. Rightmire, T. P. Kohman, and A. J. Allen, "Thick-Target Yields of Al^{26} and Na^{22} from 15-Mev Deuterons on Magnesium," Intern. J. Appl. Radiation and Isotopes 2, 274 (1957).

94. E. Rona and W. Urry, "Radioactivity and Ocean Sediments VIII. Radium and Uranium Content of Ocean and River Waters," Am. J. Sci. 250, 241 (1952).

95. J. C. Roy and T. P. Kohman, "Iron-60," Can. J. Phys. 35, 649 (1957).

96. L. P. Roy and L. Yaffe, "Search for Successive Neutron Capture Reactions on Mg^{26}, Si^{30}, and Cr^{54}," Can. J. Chem. 35, 176 (1957).

97. W. M. Sackett, H. A. Potratz, and E. D. Goldberg, "Thorium Content of Sea Water," Science 128, 204 (1958).

98. E. B. Sandell, Colorimetric Determination of Traces of Metals, 3rd ed. (Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, 1959).

99. O. A. Schaeffer, S. O. Thompson, and N. L. Lark, "Chlorine-36 Radioactivity in Rain," J. Geophys. Research 65, 4013 (1960).

100. R. A. Schmitt and R. B. Duffield, "Low-Energy Activation Functions for Photofission of U^{238} and Th^{232}," Phys. Rev. 105, 1277 (1957).

101. H. Selig, "Search for Long-Lived Natural Beta Radioactivities," U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Report NYO-6626 (1954).

102. A. A. Smales, D. Mapper, J. W. Morgan, R. K. Webster, and A. J. Wood, "Some Geochemical Determinations Using Radioactive and Stable Isotopes," Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy (United Nations, Geneva, 1958), Vol. 2, p. 242.

103. E. P. Steinberg and L E. Glendenin, "Radiochemical Investigation of the Spontaneous Fission of Cm^{242}," Phys. Rev. 95, 431 (1954).

104. H. E. Suess, "The Radioactivity of the Atmosphere and Hydrosphere," Annual Review of Nuclear Science (Annual Reviews, Inc., Palo Alto, Calif., 1958), Vol. 8, p. 243.

105. N. Sugarman and A. Haber, "Interaction of Negative Pions with Mercury," Phys. Rev. 92, 730 (1953).

106. T. T. Sugihara, P. J. Drevinsky, E. J. Troianello, and J. M. Alexander, "Fission Yields of Natural Uranium with Deuterons of 5, 10, and 13.6 Mev: Deuteron Capture and Competition with Stripping," Phys. Rev. 108, 1264 (1957).

107. T. T. Sugihara, H. I. James, E. J. Troianello, and V. T. Bowen, "Radiochemical Separation of Fission Products from Large Volumes of Sea Water. Strontium, Cesium, Cerium, and Promethium," Anal. Chem. 31, 44 (1959).

108. T. T. Sugihara and V. T. Bowen, "Radioactive Rare Earths from Fallout for a Study of Particle Movement in the Sea," Proceedings of the International Conference on Scientific and Industrial Uses of Radioisotopes, paper RICC 195 (1960).

109. T. T. Sugihara, J. Roesmer, and J. W. Meadows, Jr., "Asymmetric Fission of Bismuth," Phys. Rev. 121, 1179 (1961).

110. A. D. Suttle, Jr. and W. F. Libby, "Absolute Assay of Beta Radioactivity in Thick Solids," Anal. Chem. 27, 921 (1955).

111. W. Turchinetz and R. W. Pringle, "Decay Scheme of La^{138}," Phys. Rev. 105, 1000 (1956).

112. R. J. Velten and A. S. Goldin, "Simplified Determination of Strontium-90. Preferential Extraction of Yttrium with Tributyl Phosphate," Anal. Chem. 33, 128 (1961).

113. H. L. Volchok and J. L. Kulp, "Ionium Method of Age Determination," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta 11, 219 (1957).

114. H. Wanke and E. Vilcsek, "Argon-39 as Reaction Product of Cosmic Radiation in Iron Meteorites," Z. Naturforsch. 14a, 929 (1959).

115. H. V. Weiss and M. G. Lai, "Cocrystallization of Ultramicro Quantities of Alkaline Earth Elements with Potassium Rhodizonate. Determination of Radio-barium in Sea Water," Anal. Chem. 32, 475 (1960).

116. H. V. Weiss and M. G. Lai, "Radiochemical Determination of Radium in Urine," Anal. Chem. 33, 39 (1961).

117. J. Wing, C. M Stephens, and J. R. Huizenga, "Radioactivity of Pb^{205}," Phys. Rev. 111, 590 (1958).

118. L. Winsberg, "Interaction of Negative Pions with Iodine," Phys. Rev. 95, 198 (1954).

119. L. Winsberg, "The Production of Chlorine-39 in the Lower Atmosphere by Cosmic Radiation," Geochim. et Cosmochim. Acta 9, 183 (1956).

120. N. Yamagata, "Concentration of Cs^{137} in Coastal Waters of Japan," Nature 184, 1813 (1959).

121. N. Yamagata, "Rapid Radiochemical Determination of Cs^{137}," Analyst 85, 282 (1960).